

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding non-final Office Action mailed April 15, 2008. Upon entry of the amendments in this response, claims 1 – 20 and 22 – 35 remain pending. In particular, Applicant amends claims 1 and 19 and cancel claims 29 – 35 without prejudice, waiver, or disclaimer. Applicants cancel claims 29 – 35 merely to reduce the number of disputed issues and to facilitate early allowance and issuance of other claims in the present application. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the subject matter of these canceled claims in a continuing application, if Applicants so choose, and do not intend to dedicate the canceled subject matter to the public. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

I. Allowable Subject Matter

The Office Action indicates that claims 1 – 20 and 22 – 28 are allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action. Applicants sincerely appreciate this indication of allowed subject matter. In an effort to comply with the Office Action request, Applicants amend claims 1 and 19 and respectfully submit that claims 1 – 20 and 22 – 28 are in condition for allowance.

II. Examiner Interview

Applicant first wish to express their sincere appreciation for the time that Examiner Geib spent with Applicant's Attorney, Anthony Bonner (Reg. No. 55,012),

during a telephone discussion on May 29, 2008 regarding the outstanding Office Action. During that conversation, Examiner Geib and Mr. Bonner discussed potential arguments and amendments with regard to claims 1 – 35, in view of *Arnold*. The general thrust of the potential principal arguments included a discussion of amending the allowable subject matter in claims 1 – 20 and 22 – 28 to overcome the 35 U.S.C. §112 rejection. Further, a discussion of claims 29 – 35 resulted in no agreement. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that Examiner Geib carefully consider this response and the amendments.

III. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112

The Office Action indicates that claims 1 – 20 and 22 – 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being allegedly indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. More specifically, the Office Action alleges that, in claim 1 and 19, the element “verifying whether the thread control ID” and “a match between the thread control ID” render the claims indefinite as it is allegedly unclear which of the previously mentioned thread control IDs is being referenced. (Office Action Page 2). Further, the Office Action indicates that if the above mentioned elements are interpreted as “the thread control ID associated with the thread control element,” then it clarifies which thread control ID is being referenced. (Office Action Page 2). In an effort to comply with the Office Action request, Applicant amends claims 1 and 19, as indicated above, and submit that claims 1 – 20 and 22 – 28, as amended, are allowable in view of 35 U.S.C. §112.

IV. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

The Office Action indicates that claims 29 – 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 6,438,681 (“*Arnold*”). Accordingly, Applicant cancels claims 29 – 35 from the application and respectfully submits that claims 1 – 20 and 22 – 28 are in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that the now pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested.

Any other statements in the Office Action that are not explicitly addressed herein are not intended to be admitted. In addition, any and all findings of inherency are traversed as not having been shown to be necessarily present. Furthermore, any and all findings of well-known art and Official Notice, or statements interpreted similarly, should not be considered well-known for the particular and specific reasons that the claimed combinations are too complex to support such conclusions and because the Office Action does not include specific findings predicated on sound technical and scientific reasoning to support such conclusions.

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,

/Daniel R. McClure/

Daniel R. McClure
Reg. No. 38,962

THOMAS, KAYDEN, HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, L.L.P.
Suite 1500
600 Galleria Parkway SE
Atlanta, Georgia 30339
(770) 933-9500